

**DOE TEC Radiation Monitoring Subtopic Group Conference Call
Thursday, October 11, 2007, 3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m. EDT**

Conference Call Minutes

Participants:

Chair: Cort Richardson (CSG/NE)

Members: Mel Massaro (DOT/FRA), Ed Wilds (State of Connecticut), Vernon Jensen (Winnebago Tribe of Nebraska), Sean Kice (SSEB), Ralph Hail (Norfolk Southern), Pat Edwards (CSG/NE), Kevin Blackwell (DOT/FRA), Larry Stern (CVSA), Sarah Wochos (CSG/MW), Tim Runyon (CSG/MW), Christina Nelson (NCSL), Tony Dimond (BLET), Matt Dennis & Doug Osborn (SNL), Jim Williams (WIEB), Ralph Best & Steve Schmid (BSC)

Contractor Support: John Smegal (Legin)

Summary:

Cort Richardson welcomed the participants to the inaugural Radiation Monitoring Subtopic Group conference call and thanked them for their interest. He indicated that his Co-chair, Marty Vyenielo, was unable to make the call due to a last-minute schedule conflict, but that he had provided comments on the materials that were distributed to the group prior to the call. Cort Richardson then asked participants if they had any additions or comments on the goals and issues presented in the draft materials.

Participants then reviewed the agenda for the conference call and discussed the history of radiation monitoring within TEC. Cort Richardson asked if it was possible for DOE to develop a radiation monitoring program that will help minimize the number of inspections that will have to be performed on a given shipment. In addition, he asked the following:

- Who will conduct the inspections (e.g., FRA ala CVSA)?
- Are there states that will be satisfied by standardized inspections conducted by other states? and
- What procedures and/or certifications would be necessary?

He also acknowledged that some states would probably require separate inspections regardless of any nationwide program that was developed. He asked about the feasibility of FRA inspectors conducting radiation monitoring. Mel Massaro indicated that FRA would have to develop specialized training for the inspectors. Kevin Blackwell added that it might be more difficult to get the mechanical inspectors trained, as opposed to the

Hazmat inspectors. He also suggested that getting access to and being familiar with the necessary monitoring equipment would be a barrier to implementation.

Doug Osborn suggested including a DOE-qualified control technician as part of the escort personnel assigned to every shipment. These individuals could be responsible for conducting the radiation monitoring, as well as providing the necessary paper work. Sean Kice observed that while this approach would work under normal operating conditions, if there was an accident, the DOE technician might be injured, and therefore unable to perform his/her duties.

Tim Runyon contended that the intent of the group was not to reduce the number of inspections, but rather, to identify the technical needs and procedures necessary to support a monitoring program. He asked the following questions;

- What do the various stakeholders need in terms of monitoring data?
- How should the data be collected (i.e., instrumentation and procedures)?
- Who should collect it?
- How should the data be transmitted?

Cort Richardson stated that the group's workplan needed to address these questions. He asked participants for suggestions on the best means of gathering the data. Sarah Wochos suggested going through the SRGs. She suggested the group develop the questions, circulate them to the SRGs, and request that they ask their member states to respond within two weeks.

Ed Wilds noted that DHS was assessing radiation detection. He suggested that the group build upon these efforts, or at least confer with DHS regarding what they have found. Jim Williams commented that the group should consider the issue of radiation monitoring exclusively within the context of dedicated trains. Pat Edwards asked how many states currently had FRA Hazmat inspectors. Kevin Blackwell responded that there were 14.

Cort Richardson then asked rail industry and labor representatives whether rail workers had any thoughts or concerns about the feasibility of monitoring. Ralph Hail indicated that his constituents were all concerned about health and safety. They also realize that there will be some exposure to workers; however, they recognize the importance of conducting inspections.

Ralph Hail and Tony Dimond asked about the feasibility of installing continuous monitoring devices on the rail shipments. Doug Osborn indicated that it clearly was feasible; however, he cautioned that such devices would simply measure the baseline level of radiation, and if there were an incident/accident that resulted in a spike in the radiation levels, the devices might be destroyed or rendered inoperable by the very same

incident. Cort Richardson suggested that as part of the data gathering exercise, they should ask the states about any continuous monitoring requirements.

Larry Stern suggested that CVSA Level VI might serve as a starting point. Kevin Blackwell noted that Progress Energy is transporting material to several different sites, and perhaps these shipments could serve as a baseline, both in terms of the monitoring program and employee exposures. Ralph Best observed that Progress Energy was no longer engaged in this particular shipping campaign. He proposed monitoring train crew exposures on the on-going Paducah shipments. Cort Richardson indicated that this might be feasible, as long as the shipments were comparable to SNF shipments. He said he would explore the possibility further.

Larry Stern observed that the group would necessarily be evaluating different technologies when comparing CVSA Level VI requirements to what would ultimately comprise the DOE monitoring program. He suggested that members of the group meet with relevant agencies (e.g., DOT, DHS, DOE) to discuss and catalogue the various technologies. He also indicate that FRA would be willing to include representation from state groups on the ad hoc Rail Security and ITS Committee.

Cort Richardson concluded the discussion with a listing of action items. He committed to the following:

- Preparing a first draft of the Radiation Monitoring Subtopic Group workplan;
- Developing a set of questions for the states asking them for their technological and procedural needs with respect to radiation monitoring; and
- Exploring potential benchmarking opportunities (e.g., Paducah shipments) through discussions with DOE, DOT, and other appropriate entities.

He indicated that the next conference call would most likely be held in early December.

The call was adjourned.